

3/16/70

Mr. James B. Phoenix
Archivist of the United States
The National Archives
Washington, D.C. 20408

Dear Mr. Phoenix,

Your letter of the 15th and some of the 16 enclosures to the mail, considering that the most recent of the requests responded to in your letter is two months and 12 days old, I hope you will understand the reflected impatience.

However, because I did write you, I write now to acknowledge receipt of this letter and the enclosures.

Thank you for notifying me my account cards replenishing. A check for \$35.00 is enclosed.

I will go over the enclosures as soon as possible and will write further if it seems necessary. There is some confusion, and undoubtedly I will clarify now.

With regard to Ferrie, the newspaper of February 26, 1967, contained the report attributed to your agency that there were a total of 40 pages relating to Ferrie in your custody, of which 17 were declassified. By my check, when Mr. "phoenix" made those 13 pages available to me and then copied them for me, he deleted three duplications. While it is possible he did not give me the identifications of those still classified, he most certainly did of those declassified ones, as noted above, the press is consistent in giving a total of 40 pages. This is not a universal fabrication, nor did all reporters make an identical guess. My recollection of that conversation with Mr. "phoenix" is quite clear, including where he said these. Furthermore, I credited him with this in DECLASSIFY THE COLD CASE (p. 173), where I wrote, "Marion Jackson, efficient custodian of this archive, gathered for the press the 13 pages referred to."

Four second paragraph says, "The same file for Ferrie, however, contains the following pages in Bureau Classification Document 75 (not withheld from research): those after listed. As at your suggestion, I looked to see this file and, as I reported to you, 14 were deleted. There was no reference to any of these pages in it and quite a number of pages I have on Ferrie were not there. There was a separate folder identified as those pages from 1973. There were, as I recall, two pages in it and no reference to any withheld pages. There are more than two pages not withheld from 17 75 alone.

What I should like to know with regard to this paragraph is: are all withheld Ferrie documents in 17 75, the pages you enumerated?

The most recent of my requests for this information was December 14. In that letter I also asked for documents relating to John Martino, Melvin Tolson and Alvin Karpis. Are you say only, "the same file for Leyte Martino contains

pages 302-304 from CG 78 that are withheld from research? Are you saying there is nothing else on ~~Carters~~? You make no reference to the other two. You also do not give the date of the McCulligan interview.

With respect to CG 304-5, I look forward to getting the enlargements and I thank you for them. After examining them I will write further. When I can be in Washington I will phone to arrange to see the two photographs of CG 304 that you have prepared but do not furnish copies of. Without seeing them I do not know if I would want copies, but if you do have the pictures already in, would you mind telling me why you do not furnish copies?

Your paragraph on the picture of CG 300 is, as I have already written you, in the most serious error. Long ago you asked me to send you an electrostatic copy of that picture and I did. You now say it is the one you took for Dr. Nichols. I will not make an issue of your refusing to make a copy of this older available, although I think for a number of reasons, some of which should be obvious, you ought to. However, my writing on that picture, taken for me, under Mr. Cannon's supervision, was in the summer of 1967. It is dated. Obviously, this cannot be the picture you didn't take for Dr. Nichols until about May 28, 1968.

Your penultimate paragraph does not give the date you first gave the first two Specter memoranda available to researchers.

My request of January 4 was for the entire Burkley file. You make no reference to this. May I assume that what you sent is the entire Burkley file?

The same day, with regard to Phand, I asked for the attachments relating to CG 14267-102 plus anything else you had besides from the documents I listed. You make no reference to these attachments and duplicate the documents I told you I had, CG 301: 318,300; CG 1107: 1000-6.

With respect to CG 1140, I asked for the pages referring to Dr. Fernando Henrique other than 2 and 3. You sent the pages 1,4 and 5, which you had already provided, and also supplied what I did not ask for, pp. 6-22, which are clearly marked as a speech not by him.

I am at a loss to understand why you sent me two pages only relating to Farrie, CG 201:83-4. Unless they are the only references to Coffey and Beaumont, which I very much doubt.

For these things I did request that you sent or are sending, I do thank you. Perhaps if there were less deliberate delay in responding to my requests, some of this wasteful duplication and error might be avoided. While your letter says it is response to a number of mine going back to last December, the fact is that in those letters I repeat requests made earlier, without response.

If you would like what help I may be able to provide in straightening out the mislabelling of your pictures, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg